

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY ACCREDITATION PROGRESS REPORT

I. Background: The Shaping of the University's Response

In January 2005, President Bowen shared the findings of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) with the University community; additionally, access to the Commission's report was made available on both the ISU Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate websites. In reaffirming the University's accreditation, the Commission included the ten recommendations from the Evaluation Committee's Report. The areas identified as in need of improvement include: the development of a five-year enrollment and financial plan; improvement of the functioning of the Office of Institutional Research; evaluation of the University's computing system; improvement and linking of institutional assessment and program review with institutional planning and budgeting; clarification of oversight responsibilities within the University's decentralized management structure; updating of the institutional and college faculty workload policies to include expectations for all appointment categories; and development of a clearer definition of continuing education and a system for recording CEUs awarded. In addition, two recommendations addressed the need for the State Board of Education to publicize its workload enrollment adjustment formula, and to establish policies for the Board to evaluate its performance.

The Commission has directed the University to prepare a progress report for Fall 2005 on a subset of the recommendations, and a focused interim report and on-site visit for Spring 2006. Specifically, the University was asked to address recommendations 1, 6, 8, and 10 in this Progress Report contained herein, and recommendations 2, 3, 7, and 9 in the Spring 2006 focused interim report and visit. Although the Commission asked for no report on Recommendations 4 and 5, close relationship to the other eight recommendations has led to their inclusion in this progress report.

To respond to these recommendations the President appointed an ad hoc committee (Accreditation Working Group) in February to develop an institutional plan to address the issues identified from the recommendations, and to prepare the progress and interim reports, as specified by the Commission.

The Accreditation Working Group (Working Group) includes members from the administration, staff and faculty, specifically selected for their expertise related to the issues that underlie the recommendations and because their administrative responsibilities include those areas relevant to one or more of the recommendations. Members of the Working Group include:

- Dr. John Kijinski, Chair, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Professor of English
- Dr. Barbara Adamcik, Co-Chair, and Assistant Academic Vice President and Director of Institutional Research, and Professor of Pharmacy Administration
- Dr. Stephen Adkison, Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review, Writing Center Director, and Associate Professor of English
- Kay Christensen, Faculty Senate Chair, and Coordinator, Paralegal Studies, College of Technology
- Jennifer Fisher, Dean of Enrollment Planning and Outreach
- Kay Flowers, University Librarian, and Chair of the Technology Review and Information Group
- Randy Gaines, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services
- Dr. Terry Lay, Data Integrity Officer, and Associate Professor of Mathematics
- Kenneth Prolo, Financial Vice President/Bursar
- Dr. Peter Vik, Past Faculty Senate Chair, and Professor of Psychology
- Dr. Robert Wharton, Vice President for Academic Affairs

In addition to the Working Group, the President appointed an Accreditation Audit Group (Audit Group) to serve in an advisory capacity to ensure that the University's planned responses as conceptualized by the Working Group accurately address the specific concerns expressed in the Commission's recommendations. As the Working Group prepared drafts of the Progress Report, the Audit Group offered review and revision feedback on the drafts of this Progress Report, and will continue in this capacity as the focused interim report for Spring 2006 is being drafted. The Audit Group was also charged with reporting the progress of the Working Group to the President. The Audit Group includes members from administration and faculty who bring valuable expertise to the review and response process:

- Brad Hall, Chair, and University Attorney/Risk Manager
- Dr. Linda Hatzenbuehler, Dean of the Kasiska College of Health Professions, and Professor of Psychology
- Dr. Lee Krehbiel, Associate Dean for Student Affairs
- Dr. Al Strickland, Professor of Math, Science and Technology Education
- Dr. Richard Foster, Director of International Studies Program, and Professor of Political Science

The approach initiated by the Working Group focused on gaining understanding of the specific concerns and issues that underlie each recommendation and articulating the interrelatedness of the set of recommendations. In order to create a culture of evidence-based planning that responds efficiently and effectively to institutional and community needs, the Working Group recognized early on the need for the strategic integration of each recommendation. The approach taken by the Working Group was to address the accreditation issues as a whole because of the overlap among them, while recognizing the need to respond to each recommendation as well. To address the specific areas identified as needing improvement, the Working Group formed itself into 10 smaller subcommittees to work more effectively on the responses to the recommendations. The subgroups met frequently and each added members from the University community with expertise and/or responsibilities related to the issues being addressed. The whole Working Group met regularly (2-4 times/month) throughout the year to discuss and revise the drafts of the sections of the Progress Report prepared by the subcommittees. At periodic intervals, the Audit Group met with the Working Group to provide feedback and advice to ensure the Working Group's developing action plans would adequately address the recommendations. Appreciation of the complex interrelationships between many of the recommendations began to emerge as Working Group members articulated their understanding of the issues and institutional realities underlying each recommendation. The development and constant revision of action plans for each recommendation became a vital part of this process. Throughout the spring and summer of 2005, the Working and Audit Groups met with a range of ISU personnel to solidify their understandings of both the Commission's recommendations as well as the institutional characteristics underlying each recommendation.

This approach to organizing the University's response efforts recognizes that while the Working Group is responsible for conceptualizing and responding to the Commission's recommendations, its central task has been more specifically the development of a framework to guide the institution's efforts to address the recommendations over the long term. Implementing the changes outlined by this framework requires the commitment of time, resources, and will on the part of the institution's constituencies. As such, this Progress Report more importantly serves as an affirmation of ISU's commitment to a culture of evidence-based planning and to its growing understanding of how to effectively define and implement growth toward such a culture.

What has emerged and is reported herein is a fundamentally self-reflective response to the recommendations and the underlying institutional culture. The heart of this report is an action plan for each recommendation articulating the institution's response, based on the following:

- Actions completed: what has been done already to address the issues identified within a recommendation.
- Actions in progress: what activities or processes are currently underway and/or need to be put into place in the near-term to address the issues identified within a recommendation.
- Actions planned: what mid- and long-term goals need to be accomplished to achieve complete and consistent compliance with the NWCCU standards, as outlined in a recommendation.

These action plans will focus the efforts of the University as the institution looks beyond this Progress Report, and prepares for the focused interim report and visit in the Spring of 2006. Moreover, these plans will guide more sweeping efforts to implement evidence-based planning for institutional effectiveness over the long term. These long-term efforts form the institution's fundamental response to the Commission's concerns, since ISU's current President will retire in early October 2005, and a search is currently underway for a new president. Given an interim President appointed in October 2005, a new Academic Vice President appointed in April 2005 and a new Vice President for Health Sciences appointed in July 2005, ISU has undergone a number of significant administrative changes since October 2004. Several dean-level and other campus officers have been appointed, and several searches for new administrators are currently underway.

II. Introduction: Reading the Report

In developing this Progress Report, the Working Group early on determined that it would be difficult to report only on four recommendations, as requested by the Commission. The interrelatedness and interdependence of the concerns identified in the recommendations and the actions proposed to address them made it clear that this Progress Report should include a discussion of all ten recommendations. Rather than take a piecemeal approach to dealing with each recommendation the Working Group proposed that the most advantageous way for ISU to make progress on these issues was to conceptualize the institution's response strategically. The response can be seen as the framework for a long-term shift toward a culture of evidence-based planning, founded on sound assessment practices at all levels, as the basis for institutional effectiveness. The University is committed to addressing the underlying challenges which resulted in the Commission's recommendations.

The Working Group recognized, of course, that progress on recommendations 1, 6, 8 and 10 would be the primary focus. The reader may elect to evaluate the institution's progress on some or all of the recommendations. Each section of this report can be read largely independently. However, because the actions to address several of the recommendations are interconnected, the reader in some cases is referred to the discussion of other recommendations for more information. This is done to avoid repeating text in multiple sections of the report. The progress made on addressing each recommendation is structured similarly, although the sections of the report vary considerably in length, depending on the number of issues that must be addressed. Each section begins with a brief summary of the institution's understanding of the major issues and concerns which led to the recommendation, followed by a discussion of the actions that have been taken, actions in progress, and actions planned to address each issue identified. Additional information is provided in appendices for several of the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 1: *The Committee recommends that the University develop and promulgate a five-year enrollment and financial plan based on 1) the institutional strategic vision and plan; 2) analysis of state demography, student demand, and student cohort groups; and 3) projected state appropriations, matriculation and professional fee revenue, and other identified revenue sources, linked to the eight-year planning cycle mandated by the SBOE, to assure adequate support for program plans. (Standards 1.A.4, 1.B.2-.5, 2.E.1, 2.E.3, 4.A.4, 3.B.1, 7.A.2, and 7.B.5.)*

Recommendation 1 highlights the institution's need to engage in systematic, ongoing planning at all levels. Such planning must take into account a well-defined and widely understood mission statement and strategic plan. This planning must be participatory, based on evidence, and used to determine allocation of financial resources for programmatic development. A key part of this planning process will involve the creation and promulgation of a five-year enrollment and financial plan that will assure fiscal stability, academic quality, and responsiveness to institutional mission and service areas. Although this recommendation does not specifically cite assessment, the institution needs to show that all elements of planning are linked to systematic assessment and program review. Thus, this section of the Progress Report deals with assessment and program review as well as planning. The institution recognizes its need to reorganize its budgeting and planning procedure – particularly the need to make this process transparent, clearly driven by strategic priorities, and widely understood across the campus.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

This report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 1. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

1. The Office of Institutional Research has been reorganized to enable it to provide the data and analyses necessary for the development and implementation of the five-year enrollment and financial plan. (See discussion of Recommendation 2.)
2. In December 2004, a Dean of Enrollment Planning position was created and a new dean was appointed in January. The Dean is responsible for leading campus-wide planning efforts and setting enrollment goals in accordance with state demographics and student demand and in accordance with available resources and institutional role and mission.
3. In order to allow the Dean of Enrollment Planning to focus on long-term issues related to planning and budgeting, an Assistant Dean of Enrollment Planning has been appointed to deal with the day-to-day issues of advising and retention.
4. In Spring 2005, a new position, Vice President for Health Sciences, was established and a retired faculty member from the Department of Biological Sciences was appointed as interim VP until a new President is selected in 2006. This VP will coordinate and develop activities to better respond to the institution's strategic plans for health sciences.
5. As an initial attempt in Spring 2005 to align the annual budget to ISU's Vision and Mission statements, Strategic Plan, and the SBOE's Eight-year Plan, (See Appendices 1.1 – 1.3) the following process occurred for FY2007. It is recognized that this process did not achieve the goal of systematic planning that fully engages a university-wide constituency, but rather was an intermediate step necessitated by a very short deadline (~ 2-3 weeks) received from the SBOE.

- a. Staff in the Division of Financial Services reviewed instructions from the SBOE, including the SBOE's *Proposed FY2007 Budget Development Timeline* – (see Appendix 1.4) and *Budget Development Manual Flowchart* – (see Appendix 1.5). The President and Vice Presidents then developed budget guidelines (see Appendix 1.6 for guidelines). These were presented to the Deans and Unit Directors, who were instructed to follow these guidelines and also, where possible, to follow applicable strategic plans, consider enrollment trends and projections, and adhere to the Eight-year Plan when presenting budget requests.
 - b. The Deans finalized the recommendations from the department levels and submitted their final budget recommendations to the Academic Vice President and Budget Office.
 - c. After review by the Academic Vice President to ensure requests were in keeping with ISU's Eight-year Plan as submitted to the SBOE in 2004, recommendations were submitted to the President and Vice Presidents. They made final decisions which were submitted to the SBOE, the Division of Financial Management, and the Legislative Services Office (see Appendix 1.7).
 - d. ISU's budget recommendations were approved at the August 11, 2005, SBOE meeting.
6. In May, the Working Group convened for a day-long institutional assessment workshop with a nationally recognized expert in institutional planning and assessment, Professor Trudy Banta, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. As a result of this workshop, the Working Group developed a preliminary draft outline for an institutional assessment plan that is clearly linked to the institutional and SBOE Strategic Plans and goals (see Appendix 1.8), and which includes clearly articulated indicators for success and feedback loops that will allow the institution to incorporate assessment as an integral part of the planning process at all levels – department, college, and institution-wide.

Actions in Progress:

1. The Strategic Planning Group (SPG), a long-standing committee charged by the President with the creation and annual revision of the University's Strategic Plan in accordance with the SBOE Strategic Plan, has begun a review of the current ISU Strategic Plan and will revise it as necessary. The SPG is composed of the Deans' Council, including the new Dean of Enrollment Planning, Vice Presidents, Chief Information Officer, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review, Data Integrity Officer, Chair of the Council of Professional Employees (COPE), Chair of the Classified Employees Council (CEC), and the Student Body President of ASISU. The SPG has also been charged with development of the institutional assessment plan, which will be completed by April 1, 2006. These two documents will be reviewed by the President's staff, Deans' Council, and Faculty Senate in May 2006, and final editing will occur in June 2006.
2. The Dean of Enrollment Planning is chairing a new Presidential Task Force on Enrollment Planning. It has met once this fall, and regular meetings are planned. Membership in this group represents the Deans' Council, Offices of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Research, and Financial Services, and Faculty Senate. The Task Force has been charged with developing the five-year enrollment plan, taking the following into consideration: a) the University's current Strategic Plan; b) analysis of state demographic data, including projected student demand; c) assessment of the levels of enrollment and what mix of students the institution can effectively serve. This planning process will be linked to budgeting in the following manner:

- a. The Task Force's findings on enrollment needs and opportunities will be presented annually to Deans' Council and the President and Vice Presidents.
 - b. The Financial Vice President will be responsible for providing information on projected state revenues and student fees, particularly as expectations for resources are linked to the institution's Eight-year Plan, Strategic Plan, and mission.
 - c. The Deans' Council, the Vice Presidents, and the Task Force on Enrollment Planning together will be responsible for writing a five-year enrollment and financial planning document that will be revised each year.
3. All units on campus are reviewing their strategic and assessment plans to make sure that they reflect and support the institutional Strategic Plan. This review will be completed by Fall 2007.

Actions Planned:

The President and Vice Presidents will outline a new budget process and make it available to campus units by Spring 2006. It will include:

1. Detailed information on the budget cycle and deadlines for budget requests.
2. An overview of how a budget request moves from an individual unit through ISU's administrative structure to the final decision to recommend, or not recommend, for funding.
3. A procedure by which units making budget requests will be required to link these requests to:
 - a. The unit's strategic plan (aligned with the institutional Strategic Plan and including program level enrollment planning);
 - b. The unit's current assessment plan;
 - c. The unit's most recent program review report.
4. The outline of the budgeting process will also provide for widespread dissemination of information on budgeting decisions. Final budget decisions that involve more than routine allocation of resources – for example, funding of new programs, additions of faculty lines, decisions on distribution of equity funds – will be made available in a timely manner on a "Budget Updates" web site, which will be linked to the Office of Financial Affairs home page. A brief rationale will be included, showing how these decisions are tied to the institution's long term planning.

Summary:

Through this process, ISU will develop a culture of on-going, participatory, evidence-based planning. The planning process will be dynamic and reviewed annually. This planning process will ensure that the allocation of resources, including resources for program development, takes into account the SBOE's Strategic Plan, as well as ISU's mission, vision, Strategic Plan, plan for enrollment, and assessment at all levels in all programs across the university.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 2: *The Committee recommends that the University take immediate steps to recruit a new Director of Institutional Research and assure an effective institutional research function for planning, outcomes assessment, institutional assessment, and program review purposes. (Standards 1.B.6-9, 2.B, 6.C.2, 6.C.7.)*

The primary concern identified by the evaluation team was the need to develop a functional and effective Office of Institutional Research. This Office is responsible for provision of reliable, accurate and useful information for 1) accountability-driven reporting, 2) institutional-level assessment and planning, and 3) assessment-driven program reviews. Analyses of institutional data currently are dependent on accessing data from a number of different databases and the need for a relational database management system is obvious. These issues also are relevant to addressing the concerns identified in both Recommendations 3 and 5.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

ISU has made immediate and significant progress in addressing the above issues. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to correct these concerns and to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

1. During Fall 2004, the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) was reorganized and the responsibilities of an Assistant Academic Vice President (AAVP) were expanded to encompass the responsibilities of Director of Institutional Research. Additional staff positions were created and filled, including the Associate Director, Data Integrity Officer, Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review, and Administrative Assistant (see Appendix 2.1 for the organization chart). The office serves as the center for collection and dissemination of University-generated data relevant to report generation, assessment, planning, and program review. The AAVP/Director of OIR serves as the link between the Office of Institutional Research and senior administration of the University, the deans, and indirectly the Faculty Senate. The Director is a member of the President's staff, Strategic Planning Group, Deans' Council, and several other standing and ad hoc committees. These links are crucial to provision of accurate and timely information needed in the planning processes at several levels. The Associate Director and the Data Integrity Officer are responsible for identifying the sources of institutional data needed to complete the many reporting obligations of the Office, as well as ensuring the quality and validity of data generated by the Office. Significantly, the AAVP/Director of OIR oversees the Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review, as well as the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning. This ensures consistent linking of faculty development, course assessment and program review with the types of data that are generated and maintained by OIR. The budget for OIR was increased, as well, to ensure that this office has sufficient personnel and resources to function effectively in the areas of planning, generation of reports, outcomes assessment, institutional assessment, and program review.
2. The Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review has developed two new handbooks to replace the obsolete handbook in use at the time of the accreditation visit: one for course-based learning assessment and one for program-based review. These have been distributed to the college program assessment coordinators and faculty, and are available on the OIR webpage (www.isu.edu/instres/Assessment/handbooks.shtml) (see Appendices 2.2 and 2.3).
3. The Faculty Coordinator met with the college-level and co-curricular units on campus during Spring 2005 to discuss revising learning assessment and program review efforts. The Faculty Coordinator continues to work with college-level assessment coordinators to review assessment plans and to

archive and disseminate all current assessment plans and program review reports. More information on the assessment and program review activities is presented in the section of this report dealing with Recommendation 5.

4. In May 2005, the AAVP/Director of OIR, Faculty Coordinator, and Faculty Senate chair (all members of the Accreditation Working Group) attended the Association of Institutional Research (AIR) annual conference in San Diego to investigate what other institutions have found to be best practices to help assure that OIR plays an effective role in institutional research, assessment and planning.

Actions in Progress:

1. The OIR staff is gathering information from the academic, co-curricular, and other units on campus to determine how it can better serve their information, research, assessment, and program review needs. During the Fall semester, the staff will be talking with deans, department chairs, and unit directors to determine:
 - a. The types of information they would like to have Institutional Research provide them routinely and how often.
 - b. The types of information they would like to have Institutional Research provide them upon request and the expected timeframe for provision of this information.
 - c. The types of information they would like to have access to on the OIR web site, including information that might require a log-in for access by University personnel.
 - d. The data analyses that are perceived to be necessary or that would be useful for the implementation of the college- and program-level assessment and review efforts.
 - e. Any other information or comments that will assist the OIR staff in meeting the information needs of the various units on campus.
2. The OIR is developing a policies and procedures manual to clarify its responsibilities and delineate the services the University community can expect from OIR. Input for this process will come from a number of sources, including the discussions during the Fall semester with the deans, chairs, and directors on campus. This task will be completed by January 31, 2006.
3. The OIR web site (www.isu.edu/institres/) has been restructured and will be fully updated by December 31, 2005, and monthly thereafter to ensure the information available is current and relevant. Assessment plans, program reviews, and the various reports produced by OIR will be available on the website, as well as other information and data of interest to the University community.
4. The Faculty Coordinator, in consultation with the academic and co-curricular units on campus, is developing a specific assessment/program review cycle for all units. This calendar for reviews will be in place by December 31, 2005, and will be available on the OIR website.
5. Full effectiveness of the OIR is dependent upon its ability to provide accurate and readily available information to those who need it within the University community. This challenge is discussed in more detail in the section of this report under Recommendation 3. To begin to overcome some of the deficiencies in acquisition of data, the OIR has obtained a secure, dedicated server, housed in Information Technology Services (ITS), and has begun the process of creating a data warehouse to be used by OIR until such time as a new information system is installed and becomes operational, a process which may take several years.

Actions Planned:

1. The Associate Director of OIR will contact units on campus this Fall to seek information on how the graduating student and alumni surveys can be improved to meet the needs of the departments and programs, as well as for assessment and program review. Each unit will have the opportunity to modify the surveys to address their specific needs for their graduates. These revised surveys will be in use by April 30, 2006.
2. The OIR will assess the changing patterns in graduate and undergraduate enrollment among the colleges to assist the Task Force on Enrollment Planning with its work. A summary report will be presented to the Academic Vice President and Deans' Council by February 2006. This information also will be used in the budgeting/planning process.
 - a. By December 1, 2005, the OIR will provide statistical information on the use of lecturer and adjunct faculty to meet the needs for teaching lower division courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Academic Vice President, Dean of Enrollment Planning, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will review this information, and it will be used in the budgeting/planning process.
 - b. By December 31, 2005, the OIR will provide preliminary statistical information on low enrollment programs. This information will be reviewed by the Academic Vice President and Deans' Council, and used in the budgeting/planning process.
3. By mid-Summer 2006, when the overall institutional assessment plan has been developed and the budgeting structure is implemented, the OIR will move further in determining its precise role in providing the types of information needed to assist the entire institution in coordinating the overall budgeting and planning processes. The OIR Director then will be able to add more specific items to this list of actions planned for the future. Information collected through the process as outlined will be made available to the Task Force on Enrollment Planning. Refer to the section of this report dealing with Recommendation 1.

Summary:

The institution responded immediately to this recommendation by directing more resources to the Office of Institutional Research, which is now under new leadership with an increased staff and budget. Coordinated through this Office, improvements in assessment, program review, and planning have already occurred. Information that is currently being collected by this Office will play a key role in directing planning, assessment, program review, and budgeting efforts.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 3: *The Committee recommends that the University reach agreement as quickly as possible on data element definitions and decide whether to 1) update the legacy data management system or 2) acquire an enterprise system with the requisite functionality for planning, analysis, outcomes assessment, and institutional and program evaluation. (Standards 1.B.1, 1.B.4, 1.B.6, 1.B.8, 6.C.7, and 7.A-C.)*

Many of the concerns in this recommendation were identified in Standard 5 of the Accreditation Self-Study. As a result of the self-study process, several changes were initiated that have impacted the management and planning for information technology. ISU has recognized for some time the deficiencies in its information systems. The concerns articulated in this recommendation have clarified goals, galvanized efforts, and resulted in an aggressive and comprehensive plan of action.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

This report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 3. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

ISU has taken a number of steps dealing with personnel and structure that provide a better management and organization plan for the institution's information technology needs (see Appendix 3.1 for the organization charts). These changes will facilitate the process of reaching the best decisions concerning data management. The actions completed include the following:

1. A permanent Chief Information Officer (CIO) was appointed in November 2004, and the Computing and Communications unit was restructured and renamed the Information Technology Services (ITS) unit.
2. A new department within ITS, designated Enterprise Applications, was approved in January 2005. It combines what were separate academic and administrative information technology sub-units. A new position, Manager for Enterprise Applications, was approved.
3. A Data Integrity Officer (DIO) was appointed in November 2004 and placed in the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). The DIO works closely with ITS, OIR, and the many data clients across campus to determine information needs and expectations.
4. The Technology Oversight Council recommended, and the President approved, hiring the Gartner Consulting Group to review the present legacy systems, focusing on the gap between current services and perceived need, and to propose potential solutions regarding this specific recommendation. Their contract started April 2005, and they presented their findings in an open meeting on campus July 21, 2005 (see Appendix 3.2 for their report). After their presentation, they met with the President and Vice Presidents, the Chair of the Technology Oversight Council, the Chief Information Officer and others to outline options and to set a timeline for making a final decision on the system used to provide data as well as daily transactions for the University. As a result of this meeting, the following decisions were reached:
 - a. The current system will migrate to the new HP platform.
 - b. Development on the current in-house system will stop except for regulatory or vendor requirements.
 - c. ISU will not build a new system in house.

- d. A steering committee will be formed to guide the acquisition of an enterprise system (see item #6 below).
5. A revised information technology governance structure to replace the Technology Oversight Council was approved in April 2005, and took effect in September 2005. The new structure provides several subcommittees working on various elements of technology use on campus. These subcommittees report to the President and Vice Presidents through a smaller group, the Technology Review and Information Group (TRIG), that can meet more regularly and move more quickly in response to the changing environment (as reported to TRIG through its subcommittees).
6. In August the President appointed an ad hoc Enterprise Applications Steering Committee, broadly representative of the campus, to evaluate the institution's system needs. See #2, below.

Actions in Progress:

1. The search for the Manager of Enterprise Applications is in process.
2. The Enterprise Applications Steering Committee is collecting information on the institution's needs and systems. This Committee will engage additional outside consultants to assist in identifying the needs of the University and in preparing a Request for Proposal (RFP). A draft RFP will be completed by December 31, 2006.
3. With support from ITS, the Data Integrity Officer is working on data definitions for Institutional Research that will facilitate the development and routine population of a modest data warehouse for use by OIR to enable work to proceed relating to the reporting, analyses, assessment, and planning requirements of the institution.

Actions Planned:

The new president will make a final decision regarding the campus enterprise applications systems. This should occur in early Spring 2007.

Summary:

The key action required is the decision regarding what direction to pursue to correct the limitations of the legacy systems currently in use on campus. The decision on whether or not to invest in a comprehensive enterprise system is a difficult one, involving many constituencies and raising serious funding questions. All future actions are dependent on this decision since they will differ depending on the choice made. Therefore, additional actions are not included until this decision is reached.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 4: *The Committee recommends that the SBOE publicize its “workload enrollment adjustment formula” used to allocate the “lump sum” appropriation, identifying its component elements and indicating the time frame for periodic revision. (Standard 6.A, 6.B.3, and 6.B.8.)*

This recommendation applies to the Idaho State Board of Education, the governing board for institutions of higher education in Idaho, as well as for K-12 education and other areas.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

Actions Completed:

1. The ISU administration shared the Commission’s Report with the SBOE in November 2004.
2. The SBOE is in the process of updating its *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V. Financial Affairs, Subsection S. Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation*, which defines the objectives and methodology of the State funding process, including the enrollment workload adjustment.
 - a. At the SBOE meeting on March 10, 2005, a motion was approved for the first reading of changes to the Board’s *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V.S.2*, to update the weighting factors used in the enrollment workload adjustment calculations for Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Boise State University, and Lewis Clark State College (<http://boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/minutes/2005/>). (See Appendices 4.1 and 4.2 for current and draft of revised policies.)
 - b. The requirement to update the SBOE’s guidelines for enrollment workload adjustment also was discussed at the June 3, 2005, SBOE Financial VPs’ meeting. This process is on-going as changes occur, and involves the Division of Financial Management, the Legislative Services Office, and the SBOE. These updates should be completed by December of 2005.

Actions Planned:

1. The SBOE has scheduled a special meeting for Fall 2005, to discuss the Board’s strategic plans and their relationship with the higher education institutions’ strategic plans.
2. Later in Fall 2005, SBOE will meet with all of the Financial Vice Presidents to further discuss strategic planning.

Summary:

The update to the SBOE’s *Governing Policies and Procedures* discussed here should occur by the end of 2005 and the SBOE website will be updated to reflect the changes.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 5: *The Committee recommends that the University 1) develop and implement an institutional outcomes assessment plan and a program review schedule for all sectors; 2) identify and maintain effective support mechanisms in institutional research and financial accounting; and 3) review for revision, assuring appropriate linkages among them, the University's planning, institutional assessment, outcomes assessment, program review, and budgeting processes, with explicit assignment of specific responsibility for accountability and oversight of these processes. (Standards 1.B, 2.B, 3.B.6, 6.C.7, 7.A-C, and Policy 2.2.)*

Recommendation 5 focuses on three primary areas, as described above. The concerns for each area are detailed as follows:

1. Lack of a clear institutional assessment plan has constrained efforts a) to communicate effectively what is already being accomplished in terms of program review in academic, co-curricular, and other service units, b) to identify which programs require more focused effort, and c) to bring this information to bear on planning and budgeting processes effectively and on a timely basis. The lack of an institutional assessment plan has also hampered ISU's ability to identify and develop both Institutional Research and financial accounting resources for assessment, program review, and evidence-based planning at all levels.
2. The dysfunction of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) detailed in Recommendation 2 and the lack of a clearly articulated financial plan linked to the institution's larger Strategic Plan detailed in Recommendation 1 have made it difficult to provide support mechanisms for assessment, program review, and planning. The need exists a) to identify what OIR resources are necessary to support effective program review at all levels in academic, co-curricular, and other units, as well as other University planning needs, and b) to ensure that adequate mechanisms are in place to both develop and maintain those resources.
3. The University also recognizes the need to clearly articulate, then review and revise where necessary: a) University-level planning procedures; b) institutional assessment procedures; c) outcomes assessment and program review procedures at institutional, college, and programmatic levels, d) and the connected budgeting processes.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

This section of the report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 5. Information is provided below on the specific actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

1. The position of Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review in the Office of Institutional Research has been reconstituted. The Faculty Coordinator serves as an institutional advocate for assessment and program review in general, and as a resource for procedures and requirements aimed at developing a culture of sound assessment effectively integrated with educational quality within and across programs, both academic and co-curricular. The Faculty Coordinator works to: a) integrate unit, program, and course assessment with unit and faculty development efforts and b) develop and offer a range of assessment training and development opportunities for assessment coordinators, faculty, and administrators. The Faculty Coordinator also tracks the status of assessment and program review efforts, monitors deadlines and maintains a catalog of assessment coordinators, plans, reports, and larger program reviews.

2. The Office of Institutional Research has been restructured and its personnel augmented, as discussed for Recommendation 2 (see Appendix 2.1 for the organization chart).
3. College-level and co-curricular unit assessment coordinators, in conjunction with the Faculty Coordinator, have articulated or clarified lines of communication and feedback, reporting deadlines, and accountability for program- and unit-level assessment and program review efforts within each of the colleges and co-curricular units. Program- and unit-level accountability has been established in the relevant dean's or unit head's office, and is typically overseen by an assistant or associate dean acting as the designated college or unit assessment coordinator and who works with either newly-appointed or pre-existing assessment committees within the units.
4. The Faculty Coordinator developed two new assessment handbooks to replace the circa 1999 OIR Assessment Handbook. The two new handbooks, *Program-Based Review and Assessment* and *Course-Based Review and Assessment*, are widely distributed across campus through hard copy and the OIR website (<http://www.isu.edu/instres/Assessment/handbooks.shtml>). The handbooks serve as a fundamental resource for articulating how outcomes-based assessment enables the improvement of student learning and how such assessment enables sound program review in academic and some co-curricular units. (See Appendices 2.2 and 2.3.)
5. In February 2005, ISU's Center for Teaching and Learning sponsored a campus-wide administrative and faculty development workshop with Peggy Maki, former AAHE Director of Assessment. Each participant received Maki's recently published book *Assessing for Learning*. Participants included faculty as well as deans, assessment coordinators and/or program/department chairs from academic and co-curricular units across campus, and staff.
6. The ISU Deans' Council has been designated the Assessment Coordinating Council, meeting as needed to coordinate program- and college-level program review and assessment efforts with larger institutional assessment and planning efforts. In order to address the Commission's concerns about program proliferation, the Deans' Council, meeting as the Assessment Coordinating Council, will serve also as the reviewing body for the program planning and budgeting process identified under Recommendation 1.
7. Meetings with department and college assessment coordinators and the Faculty Coordinator have communicated a renewed focus on assessment and the improvement of student learning as the foundation for effective program review for academic and co-curricular units across the institution. Coordination of processes and schedules tailored to the needs of individual programs have been discussed also, as well as the status of current assessment plans, reports, and program reviews. Where applicable, the merging of specialized accreditation reports/review efforts with larger campus-wide program assessment and review efforts has been established, and the schedules for completion of assessment plans, assessment reports, and program reviews for each program within the respective colleges have been revised.
8. College-level assessment workshops have followed the Maki workshop. Designed to meet the needs of specific programs in each of the colleges and co-curricular units, these workshops offered by the Faculty Coordinator provide resources and feedback to program-level assessment and review efforts. Working with assessment specialists in the College of Education, the Faculty Coordinator has developed these workshops to meet specific unit-level needs. Focused primarily in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Technology, these workshops have been scheduled as needed in other units.

Actions in Progress:

1. Assessment plans and program review schedules for all units — academic, co-curricular, and support — are being developed or reviewed and revised, in accordance with “best practice” principles of assessment. Current assessment plans and review schedules for academic and co-curricular units will be available on the OIR website. Current assessment plans and review schedules for support units will be available on a given unit’s website. All units should have assessment plans and review schedules in place by May 31, 2006.
2. The OIR Assessment and Program Review website is under revision. (See also OIR website revision under Recommendation 2.) The website will focus on offering web-based assessment resources, as well as information concerning physical resources in the OIR. The University will also move toward warehousing all assessment and program review data in a secure section of this website. This website revision will be completed by December 31, 2005.
3. The Faculty Coordinator, in conjunction with the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, is developing college- and department-specific workshops aimed at providing course- and unit-level faculty development and assessment resources.

Actions Planned:

1. The relationships between the University’s planning, budgeting, and institutional assessment processes are being articulated. These relationships are discussed in detail in the section of this report which responds to Recommendation 1.
2. OIR staff will identify and develop the means to provide the assessment-driven data needed for effective program review and outcomes assessment. (See also Recommendation 2.)
3. The University will identify and develop assessment resources to support effective program-level review and assessment. Long-term support for a culture of evidence-based planning and assessment will require a range of resources housed in the Office of Institutional Research, including a roster of assessment specialists from the Center for Teaching and Learning, the College of Education, and from programs/units with specialized accreditations. The Faculty Coordinator will meet with college and departmental assessment coordinators to determine their known assessment resource needs, survey the assessment literature to determine other potential assessment resources, and survey other assessment officers/IR directors to determine other potential assessment resources.
4. The Deans and Vice Presidents will revise and articulate the University’s planning processes. Review of the University’s planning is explained in more detail in the section of this report which responds to Recommendation 1.
5. The Deans and Vice Presidents will revise and articulate the University’s budgeting processes. Review of the University’s budgeting is articulated in detail in the section of this report which responds to Recommendation 1.

Summary:

The three primary areas of concern expressed in Recommendation 5 are complex and deeply connected to many of the concerns identified in the other recommendations. Recommendation 5 has provided the opportunity for the institution to review its approach to program review and assessment and effective planning at all levels.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 6: *The Committee recommends that the SBOE establish policies for the promulgation of its annual goals and for periodic evaluation of its performance. (Standard 6.B.6.)*

This recommendation involves the actions of the SBOE, the governing board for institutions of higher education in Idaho, as well as for K-12 education and other agencies.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

Actions Completed:

1. The ISU Administration shared the accreditation report with the SBOE in November 2004.
2. The SBOE prepares an annual overview of its agencies using financial data incorporated into the Board agendas on a quarterly basis. The Office of the State Board of Education's Agency Overviews were presented as an information item at the March 10, 2005, Board meeting. They included the functions of the SBOE and its governance policy (See Appendix 6.1).
3. The SBOE Strategic Plan 2000-2005, and its Institutional Role and Missions statement can be found online at <http://boardofed.idaho.gov/overview/index.asp> and http://boardofed.idaho.gov/policies/r_m.asp and are included as Appendix 6.2.

Actions Planned:

1. A special SBOE meeting is scheduled for Fall 2005 to review and update the Board's and the institutions' strategic plans.
2. When completed, the updated SBOE policies for its annual goals and performance evaluation will be communicated to University staff and faculty and incorporated into ongoing planning and assessment efforts.

Summary:

ISU is working with the SBOE and other institutions on this recommendation; however, a completion date cannot be established until after the Special SBOE meeting in late Fall 2005.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 7: *The Committee recommends that the SBOE and the President review and clarify oversight responsibilities within the University's decentralized management structure to assure effective functioning and accountability. (Standard 6.B.7, 6.C.2, 6.C.6,6.D)*

Recommendation 7 identifies the need to clarify the institution's existing oversight and accountability functions and to develop clear channels of communication (including efficient availability of institutional research data) which a decentralized management structure requires. The Commission's Report cites a need to develop a mechanism that allows for discussion and agreement on common goals, objectives, and policies to integrate and communicate planning at all levels.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

This report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 7. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

1. To assure accountability in the decentralized management structure, the deans and other executive officers will continue to be evaluated annually. The executive officers are evaluated by the President; the deans are evaluated by the Academic Vice President. The evaluation process considers both the deans' personal and unit-level goals and objectives and evaluates progress toward achieving them. The deans' annual goals constitute the primary mechanism of accountability for college deans and form the basis of their annual evaluations.
2. The Fall 2005 agenda set by the Strategic Planning Group includes a review of the colleges' strategic plans and related goals to assure consistency with institutional goals.
3. To improve efficiency and ensure oversight and accountability in the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), additional staff and significant organizational changes have occurred. The new OIR staff is listed below (See also Appendix 2.1).
 - a. Assistant VP for Academic Affairs and Director of Institutional Research with dual reporting to the VP for Academic Affairs and VP for Financial Services
 - b. Associate Director with budget and accounting experience
 - c. Data Integrity Officer
 - d. Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and Program Review
4. To enhance enrollment planning a dean responsible for that area has also been added. The new Dean of Enrollment Planning will coordinate and oversee the actions described in this report under Recommendations 9 and 10.

Actions Planned:

1. The Academic VP is establishing a platform for ongoing discussions of institutional goals that ensures the investment and commitment of key groups, including faculty, deans, senior administrators, and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Thus far, OIR has been enhanced (see Actions Completed #3 above), the OIR's collaborative relationship with Deans' Council and Faculty Senate is being clarified, and the interrelationship between these three groups and senior administration (Academic Vice President, Financial Vice President) is being articulated. (See item #1

under “Actions in Progress,” Recommendation 1.)

2. The Faculty Senate is in the process of developing a mechanism for faculty to provide evaluative feedback to administrators. Thus far, the Faculty Senate has piloted an initial evaluation of University administrators in Spring 2005. The faculty response rate was 45.7 percent. In June 2005, the President appointed a committee that includes the Academic Vice President, two academic deans, and the Faculty Senate Chair, and charged the committee to review the process for evaluation for administrators (deans and higher).

Summary:

Through this process ISU will clarify the institution’s existing oversight and accountability functions of its decentralized management structure while establishing a mechanism between key groups for ongoing review of institutional plans. This process will facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment. This process will also be communicated to the SBOE.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 8: *The Committee recommends that the University 1) review for revision and updating its faculty workload policies for all faculty appointment categories; and 2) review for clear articulation the qualifications and expectations of faculty appointed to the various ranks and within the various appointment categories at the University. (Standard 4.A.3 and 4.A.5-6.)*

From a review of the comments in the NWCCU Comprehensive Evaluation Report, the Working Group has identified the following concerns of the evaluation team related to ISU's faculty evaluation and faculty workload policies and procedures. These specific issues, as articulated in the review report, include the following:

1. Faculty workload expectations are not clearly defined or articulated. The Commission's Report noted that the generic faculty workload policy (*Appendix E of the ISU Faculty/Staff Handbook*) is based on a 15-unit dimensionless scale. This is generally apportioned as 9 units of teaching, and 3 each of research and service in defining the expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The policy does not clearly articulate the distribution patterns for other categories of faculty appointments – clinical, research, adjunct/lecturers, and College of Technology instructors. In some colleges or departments/programs, this had led to confusion and perceived inconsistencies in expectations for these categories of faculty appointments.
2. The relationship between the annual faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions is not clearly articulated, and the tenure and promotion process is unclear in many colleges. This lack of clarity of existing relationships and/or lack of an articulated relationship hampers the consistent implementation of established college-level procedures for promotion and tenure. Additionally, the lack of clarity introduces some level of confusion among junior faculty preparing for the tenure and promotion process and among departmental faculty assigned to tenure and promotion committees.
3. There appears to be wide variation in how annual evaluations of faculty are conducted among colleges and departments/programs, and the perception exists that there is inconsistency and therefore unfair application of evaluation criteria and procedures. Variations in how annual faculty evaluations are approached among colleges and departments/programs within a given college often reflect differing programmatic and/or discipline-specific needs. However, a lack of overt communication concerning these specific differences has led to confusion over the consistency with which these evaluations are implemented. Certain variations for which there is no specific basis also exist across programs because of a lack of communication and oversight concerning implementation of annual evaluations; this type of variation often generates the perception that criteria and procedures are inconsistent. This issue is closely related to #4 below.
4. The evaluation processes and criteria for the various categories of faculty appointments are not clearly articulated. In that variation and the attendant perception of inconsistency exists across the range of colleges and departments/programs, a similar lack of clarity exists for the same procedures across the different categories of faculty appointments. Part of the confusion in this respect arises from the lack of clear definitions of the faculty categories in practice.
5. There appears to be some conflict or disconnect regarding evaluation of research faculty. A small number of faculty with research appointments through the Office of Research have been placed in some departments/programs and this has generated confusion among some department faculty concerning the role and responsibilities of these research faculty, as well as the attendant responsibility for evaluation. In fact, the current policy concerning research faculty was articulated by the Research Coordinating Council in the late 1990s and clearly defines the scope of expectations for research faculty as well as the responsibility of the Office of Research for their evaluation. The evaluation guidelines and form are available on the Office of Research website

(www.isu.edu/research/manual/section8/evalguid.pdf ; www.isu.edu/research/manual/section8/evalform.pdf) and are included as Appendix 8.1.

6. There is no indication of the relationship between changing department workloads and institutional planning. Given the impact of vaguely defined college faculty workload policies as discussed in item #5 above, it has proven difficult to articulate a consistent relationship between changing department workloads and institutional planning. As noted in the review report, perceptions vary widely in terms of how departmental workloads are affected by larger institutional planning and assessment efforts.
7. The allocation of graduate assistantships, as well as attendant library resources, do not appear to be based on changing program needs, but rather primarily on historical patterns, and do not appear to be tied to institutional planning. Again, the larger lack of an institutional assessment plan has made it difficult to connect resource allocation to institutional and/or programmatic growth as the result of overt planning and conscious decision-making rather than in response to prior, yet often unclearly examined, needs/uses. This seems to have been particularly true of graduate assistantships and library resources.

REPORT ON PROGRESS

This report discusses the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 8. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to address the identified issues and to respond with this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

The general ISU Faculty Workload Policy (*ISU Faculty/Staff Handbook, Appendix E*) was revised by the Faculty Professional Policies Council of the Faculty Senate in Spring 2005. The revised University policy more clearly identifies the categories of faculty appointments and the potential for differing workload distribution patterns for the various non-tenure track appointments, for faculty in different stages of their academic careers, and to meet the unique needs of the colleges. The Faculty Workload Policy is by design general, and more specific workload definitions for faculty are the responsibility of the colleges. The revised policy was approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15 and the Deans' Council on April 19, 2005 (see Appendix 8.2). The revised Policy is available on the Faculty Senate website (www.isu.edu/fsen/Notices/index0203.html) and *Appendix E* of the *ISU Faculty/Staff Handbook* (<http://www.isu.edu/fs-handbook/appendix/appe.html>) has been updated.

Actions in Progress:

1. The college deans have initiated a process for review (and revision as needed) of their college's workload policies to align them with the revised University Workload Policy described above. The colleges' policies will include specific details related to workload expectations for the various categories of faculty employed within that college. The revised college workload policies are to be completed by April 1, 2006, and will be presented in April to the Deans' Council for discussion and comment. Each college's workload policy will be distributed to the faculty of the college and posted on the college's website by May 1, 2006.
2. The college deans have begun to discuss how changes in overall department workload will be factored into both college-level and institution-wide review and planning efforts. These efforts will be discussed in March 2006 at a Deans' Council meeting, and will be used to inform updating of the colleges' strategic and financial planning activities, as well as future budget requests.

3. The Library, through the University Library Committee (a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate's Curriculum Council) has examined current procedures for the allocation of library resources to colleges and departments/programs. A procedure has been developed whereby departments will be invited to submit applications for additional funds, and these applications will be reviewed by the entire committee for funding. The current system of communication and feedback through department/program faculty representatives serves as the first step for ensuring that specific program needs are communicated to the library bibliographers for further action/allocation planning. As new programs are developed, the library faculty review existing library resources against program requirements, identifying needed resources and funding, and planning current expenditures appropriately.
4. The deans have begun reviewing their college faculty evaluation policies and procedures for both annual evaluations and promotion and tenure for all categories of faculty appointments, including non-tenure track faculty, to assess for clarity and consistency across departments as well as consistency in how annual evaluations are linked to promotion and tenure reviews. The revised college policies and procedures will be discussed in April 2006 at a Deans' Council meeting to ensure appropriate consistency both across the colleges and with respect to the institutional assessment plan. The revised policies will be posted on the colleges' websites and paper copies will be distributed to faculty in the colleges in May. The revised evaluation procedures will be in effect beginning in Fall 2006.

Actions Planned:

1. The college deans will develop a set of questions to which faculty can respond to assess how well the promotion and tenure and other faculty evaluation processes are meeting their expectations and serving their needs as faculty. Deans' Council will develop these questions by April 2006.
2. The Dean of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Council will review the policies and procedures whereby graduate assistantships are allocated to colleges/departments in response to changing programmatic and workload needs. The revised policies are to be presented to Deans' Council by April 2007.

Summary:

The actions discussed above as completed, in progress, or planned represent the foundational work needed to address the concerns related to faculty workload and evaluations articulated in the review report under Recommendation 8. Key aspects of these actions will be served by the development and implementation of an institutional assessment plan as a guiding document providing consistency in planning, review, and allocation of resources across the University.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 9: *The Committee recommends that the University 1) develop a clear definition of Continuing Education at Idaho State University; 2) identify the various Continuing Education activities within the University; and 3) articulate the organizational and administrative relationships among those activities. (Standard 2.G.4)*

Recommendation 9 addresses the need for the institution to: a) define continuing education, and b) articulate the organizational structure for continuing education and administrative relationships among and between the various colleges and other campus units offering continuing education and professional development activities.

Historically, ISU has had a hybrid model of continuing education, with both decentralized and centralized components. Some programming was decentralized to meet the needs of special constituent groups, especially in the health professions programs. Professional development courses for K-12 teachers are offered by the Intermountain Center for Educational Effectiveness in the College of Education, and Workforce Training activities are offered by the College of Technology. Centrally, the Office of Continuing Education supports programs such as the annual Idaho Conference on Health Care, Elderhostel, and New Knowledge Adventures.

While most of the University's professional programs offer continuing education to their graduates and professionals in the disciplines, there has been no central inventory of such activities offered by other campus units, and no formal structure to coordinate or promote the array of continuing education programs offered by the institution. An inventory of all continuing education activities offered by ISU needs to be created addressing the following questions:

1. How are continuing education programs at the institution developed, approved, and assessed?
2. Who is responsible for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities?
3. How are continuing education activities coordinated across campus?
4. How do the goals and objectives for continuing education at ISU fit within the goals set by the State Board of Education (SBOE) for continuing education in Idaho and the mission, vision, and goals for the institution?

REPORT ON PROGRESS:

This report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 9. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Actions Completed:

1. Several changes have occurred in the administrative structure of continuing education at ISU. The hybrid model described above with its centralized and decentralized components will continue, but will be improved by systematically linking institutional policies and administrative units that offer continuing education. This connection will be accomplished through the newly established Coordinating Council for Extended Learning (see #4 below), which reports annually to the President. By setting goals for extended learning that are aligned with ISU's mission and Strategic Plan and the minimum standards for CE activities established by the SBOE, progress has been made in the areas of development, monitoring, and assessment of continuing education programs.
2. The centralized operation of the Office of Continuing Education (CE) has been established in a dedicated facility and has been restructured. The new facility is now nearing capacity housing a wide variety of departments and functions. The new Continuing Education unit consists of an Executive

Director of Continuing Education, and two new positions: a Director of Conferencing and a Director of Marketing for CE. These two positions report to the Executive Director of CE who reports to the Dean of Enrollment Planning and Outreach. The Executive Director has been assigned responsibility to work with department/program chairs and college deans in the approval process and to monitor all continuing education, special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for credit or non-credit. The Executive Director is responsible to assure that all continuing education activities are accountable to and monitored by the appropriate undergraduate or graduate organizations of the institution, and to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the information recorded in the comprehensive record system that is used for awarding Continuing Education Units (CEUs) or other comparable measures. This record system will be a component of ISU's overall information system.

3. As indicated above, a campus-wide Coordinating Council for Extended Learning was appointed by the President. This Council is chaired by the Executive Director of CE, and is charged with determining the full scope of continuing education activities at ISU, exploring potentials for greater University participation in continuing education, and planning and implementing programming. The Council meets monthly, and includes members from the following constituent groups:
 - a. The Workforce Training Programs in the College of Technology
 - b. Colleges, including some large departments
 - c. ISU Outreach sites: Idaho Falls, Boise, Twin Falls, and Coeur d'Alene
 - d. Financial Services, Enrollment Planning, Registrar's Office, and Information Technology
 - e. The Intermountain Center for Educational Effectiveness
 - f. The Sawtooth Science Institute
 - g. Faculty Senate
 - h. Graduate School
4. The Coordinating Council emphasizes the notion of a systems approach to continuing education in order to systematically link all policies and functional areas that have an impact upon CE enrollment and programming, and to create an organizational system that encourages closer communication and cooperation among the campus units that currently offer CE.
5. To articulate the organizational structure and administrative relationships of extended learning activities to various academic units and the centralized organization of CE, the Executive Director of CE and the Dean of Enrollment planning have developed a new organization chart. The chart was presented to the Coordinating Council for Extended Learning and posted on the Continuing Education website in Fall, 2005 (see Appendix 9.1).

Actions in Progress:

1. The following definition of continuing education, from the SBOE's *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.L.1*, is being used as a guide to the newly constituted Coordinating Council for Extended Learning who will be assigned the task of developing an ISU specific definition:

Continuing education is the philosophy and the process under which an institution, organization, agency, or individual provides organized learning activities for the professional or personal development of adults whose primary role is ordinarily something other than a student. Continuing education usually involves off-campus, weekend, or evening instruction, but it may also include daytime and on-campus instruction. The general functions of continuing education include, but are not limited to, the personal development and cultural enrichment of the individual and community; licensing and certification for professional and practitioner qualifications; and credential and degree achievement. Of these functions, personal development and cultural

enrichment are offered for non-credit. (See Appendix 9.2).

2. The Executive Director of CE and others are preparing a central inventory of all continuing education programs offered by ISU.
3. A draft vision and mission statement for continuing education is to be reviewed by the Coordinating Council for Extended Learning in January 2006.
4. As is discussed in Recommendation 3, an Enterprise Applications Steering Committee has been assigned the task of presenting final recommendations on ISU's future information system. A CEU component that will integrate into this larger information system may be purchased early in order to track CEUs while a decision on a complete information system is being made. This CEU component will be an integral part of ISU's overall information system.

Actions Planned:

1. A strategic plan and an assessment plan for Continuing Education, based on the goals, objectives, and marketing plan of ISU will be developed by Fall 2007. These plans will:
 - a. Ensure that goals for the professional programs that offer CE and the Office of Continuing Education are in alignment and clearly articulated in the CE strategic and assessment plans. ISU maintains responsibility for the academic quality of all programs and courses through management and supervision by its faculty and administrators. Special courses or programs will complement but will not directly compete with institutional programs.
 - b. In coordination with Financial Services, ensure that procedures are created and followed for fiscal responsibility and that activities continue to be revenue producing for both the professional programs and the Office of Continuing Education.
2. The criteria and procedures for awarding CEUs and for keeping student records will be reviewed and revised as necessary by December 2006.
3. The goals for extended learning at ISU will be aligned with the institution's Mission and Strategic Plan and the Minimum Standards for Continuing Education Activities as established by the SBOE (see Appendix 9.3). These goals include:
 - 1) All academic credit activities shall be equivalent in quality to comparable instructional courses and programs offered on the ISU campus, especially with respect to:
 - a) The appointment, orientation, supervision, and evaluation of faculty members in the courses, programs, or activities;
 - b) Procedures for the approval of courses, programs, or activities;
 - c) The stature of the curriculum with respect to its organization, appropriateness, level, intellectual demands, instructional contact time, and out-of-class effort;
 - d) The admission of students, the advising process, and the evaluation of student performance in courses, programs, or activities;
 - e) The support offered by library, classroom, laboratory, and other resources;
 - f) The detailed as well as general responsibility for the quality of courses, programs, and activities accepted by the appropriate academic and administrative units on the campus; and
 - g) The keeping of student records for such activities as admission, academic performance, and transfer credit.

- 2) All academic credit and non-credit activities will conform to institutional role and mission policies.
- 3) ISU will not offer undergraduate or graduate courses or programs unless there is reasonable access to faculty, library materials, and other resources of the appropriate on-campus units because of the heavy and sophisticated demands made by some undergraduate and graduate courses, programs, or activities upon:
 - a) Library resources (and, in appropriate cases, laboratory and clinical resources);
 - b) The availability of a sufficient number of advanced faculty members in the academic unit to confer and decide on evaluation of student progress in all aspects of courses, programs, activities, and research; and
 - c) The availability of faculty members in related fields for advice and guidance and service on examining committees.

Summary:

Continuing education is being formally defined at Idaho State University. CE at ISU is a hybrid model with both centralized and decentralized components. The centralized operation has been restructured and staffed to better serve the community. A Coordinating Council for Extended Learning has also been established that will systematically link all policies and functional areas that have impact upon continuing education enrollments and offerings. Various continuing education activities have been and will continue to be institutionalized.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 10: *The Committee recommends that the University develop a consistent and comprehensive record system for recording awards of Continuing Education Units – or other comparable measures – for participation in non-credit courses, programs, and experiences. (Standard 2.H.3 and Policy A-9.)*

In Recommendation 10, the Commission is asking that the institution develop a process and system for recording the award of Continuing Education Units (CEUs). No central responsibility for coordination or tracking of these activities previously existed.

REPORT ON PROGRESS:

This report presents a brief discussion of the progress the institution has made in addressing the concerns articulated in Recommendation 10. Information is provided below on the specific activities or actions that have been completed, those that are in progress, and those that are planned for the future to respond to this recommendation.

Recommendations 9 and 10 are closely related. Recommendation 9 asks the institution to develop a clear definition of continuing education, identifying the various continuing education functions, and articulate the organizational and administrative relationships. Many of the actions completed for Recommendation 9 are key to making progress on Recommendation 10, which asks the institution to develop a consistent and comprehensive record system for recording CEUs awarded.

Actions Completed:

An Executive Director of Continuing Education (CE) has been assigned the responsibility to work with the department chairs and college deans in the approval process and to monitor continuing education courses offered for credit or non-credit. The Executive Director of CE will assure that all continuing education activities are centrally accountable and monitored for consistency (See CE organization chart in Appendix 9.1).

Actions in Progress:

1. Standards are being developed and documented for recording CEUs. These standards are being drafted by the Executive Director of CE for approval by the Coordinating Council and the Deans' Council and will be disseminated to the University community by February 2006.
2. A University-wide process for recording CEUs is being developed based on these standards to replace the pre-existing mix of discrete tracking systems in use. This process will involve creation of course approval forms, program participant forms, CEU request forms, and other documentation. While ISU is transitioning to a new information system, the Executive Director will ensure CEUs are recorded and tracked. This tracking may be done in a variety of ways by individual units until a comprehensive record system is in place; however, the University will improve its ability to keep track of the awarding of CEUs across the campus. The time-course approval forms, program participant forms, CEU request forms, as well as other CE process forms will be provided to the Coordinating Council for approval and dissemination to the campus community by February 2006.
3. Currently, commercial software systems are being evaluated and previewed for potential use in recording CEUs.

Actions Planned:

As indicated in the discussion of Recommendations 3 and 9, an Enterprise Applications Steering Committee has been assigned the task of presenting final recommendations on ISU's future information system. A CEU component that will integrate into this larger information system may be purchased early in order to track CEUs while a decision on a complete information system is being made.

Summary:

By February 2006, ISU will have finalized the process for recording awards of CEUs or comparable measures. The Enterprise Applications Steering Committee will decide on a final recommendation for ISU's future information system. A CEU component that will integrate into this larger information system may be purchased early. This CEU component will be an integral part of ISU's overall information system.

In combination with the activities completed for Recommendation 9, the actions described above will allow the University to clearly define continuing education at ISU, better provide the various constituents with lifelong learning opportunities, systematically link all policies and functional areas that have impact upon continuing education enrollments and offerings, and assure consistent and comprehensive recording of Continuing Education Units.

III. Progress Report: Concluding Statement

This report details the progress Idaho State University has made in addressing the specific concerns articulated by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities in their Comprehensive Evaluation Report. The Commission asked the University to report on the progress made on Recommendations 1, 6, 8, and 10 for Fall 2005 and to prepare for an evaluation visit in Spring 2006 concerning Recommendations 2, 3, 7, and 9. While the Comprehensive Evaluation Report found the University substantially in compliance with Recommendations 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10, the University was also found not in compliance with regard to Recommendations 2, 6, and 9.

The University has made substantial progress in addressing Recommendations 1, 8, and 10 as of the date of this report and continues to work with the SBOE to ensure progress on Recommendation 6. Moreover, as this report details, the institution has also made substantial progress in addressing the Recommendations to be reviewed in the Spring 2006 visit, 2, 3, 7, and 9. Of these latter Recommendations, the institution has almost completely addressed the concerns in Recommendation 2, and is moving rapidly to implement substantial efforts which have been developed to address Recommendations 3, 7, and 9.

Finally, of the remaining Recommendations, 5 has received substantial focused attention resulting in a strong foundation for moving toward a culture of assessment at the University. The institution also continues to work with the SBOE on Recommendation 4 and anticipates substantive progress regarding those concerns by early 2006.

In sum, Idaho State University has taken the opportunity represented by the Comprehensive Evaluation Report to reaffirm its commitment to institutional effectiveness as represented by the Commission standards on accreditation and welcomes continued dialogue with the Commission to ensure sound resolution of their concerns as the University continues serving our mission.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 1.1 ISU's Mission and Vision Statements
- Appendix 1.2 ISU's Strategic Plan
- Appendix 1.3 SBOE's Eight-Year Plan
- Appendix 1.4 SBOE's *Proposed FY2007 Budget Development Timeline*
- Appendix 1.5 SBOE's *Budget Development Manual Flowchart*
- Appendix 1.6 ISU Budget Guidelines
- Appendix 1.7 ISU Budget Requests Submitted to the SBOE
- Appendix 1.8 Draft of and Outline for the ISU Institutional Assessment Plan
- Appendix 2.1 Office of Institutional Research Organization Chart
- Appendix 2.2 *Course-Based Review and Assessment Handbook*
- Appendix 2.3 *Program-Based Review and Assessment Handbook*
- Appendix 3.1 Technology Review and Information Group Organization Chart
- Appendix 3.2 Gartner Consulting Group's Report
- Appendix 4.1 SBOE's *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V.S.2, Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation (BSU, ISU, LCSC, UI)*
- Appendix 4.2 March 10, 2005 SBOE Meeting – First Reading of Revision of *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V.S.2, Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation (BSU, ISU, LCSC, UI)*
- Appendix 6.1 SBOE Agency Overview presented at the March 10, 2005 Board Meeting
- Appendix 6.2 SBOE's Strategic Plan and Institutional Role and Missions statement
- Appendix 8.1 Office of Research Policy on Evaluation of Research Faculty, and Research Faculty Evaluation Form
- Appendix 8.2 Revised ISU Faculty Workload Policy
- Appendix 9.1 Office of Continuing Education Organization Chart
- Appendix 9.2 SBOE's *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.L.1, Definition and Function* [of Continuing Education]
- Appendix 9.3 SBOE's *Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.L.6, Minimum Standards for Continuing Education Activities*

Appendix 1.1

ISU's Mission and Vision Statements

Appendix 1.2

ISU's Strategic Plan

Appendix 1.3

SBOE's Eight-Year Plan (includes ISU's Eight-Year Plan)

Appendix 1.4

SBOE's Proposed FY2007 Budget Development Timeline

Appendix 1.5

SBOE's Budget Development Manual Flowchart

Appendix 1.6

ISU Budget Guidelines

Appendix 1.7

ISU Budget Requests Submitted to the SBOE

Appendix 1.8

Draft of and Outline for the ISU Institutional Assessment Plan

Appendix 2.1

Office of Institutional Research Organization Chart

Appendix 2.2

Course-Based Review and Assessment Handbook

Appendix 2.3

Program-Based Review and Assessment Handbook

Appendix 3.1

Technology Review and Information Group Organization Chart

Appendix 3.2

Gartner Consulting Group's Report

Appendix 4.1

***SBOE's Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V.S.2,
Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation (BSU, ISU, LCSC, UI)***

Appendix 4.2

**March 10, 2005 SBOE Meeting – First Reading of Revision of
*Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V.S.2,
Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation (BSU, ISU, LCSC, UI)***

Appendix 6.1

**SBOE Agency Overview presented at the
March 10, 2005 Board Meeting**

Appendix 6.2

SBOE's Strategic Plan and Institutional Role and Missions statement

Appendix 8.1

Office of Research Policy on Evaluation of Research Faculty, and Research Faculty Evaluation Form

Appendix 8.2

Revised ISU Faculty Workload Policy

Appendix 9.1

**Office of Continuing Education
Organization Chart**

Appendix 9.2

***SBOE's Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.L.1,
Definition and Function [of Continuing Education]***

Appendix 9.3

***SBOE's Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.L.6,
Minimum Standards for Continuing Education Activities***